

### **Remarks**

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 11 and 21 have been amended. No claims have been added or canceled. Thus, claims 1-30 are pending.

### **SUPPORT FOR AMENDMENTS**

Support for the claim amendments may be found, for example, in paragraphs 0016 and 0017. No new matter has been added by way of amendment.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

Claims 1-30 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0259688 of Forte (*Forte*) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2007/0082668 of Silver, et al. (*Silver*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1-30 are not rendered obvious by *Forte* and *Silver*.

Claim 1 recites:

receiving an incoming telephone call at a private branch exchange, the telephone call directed to a telephone extension of the private branch exchange corresponding to a user;

determining a call routing preference associated with the extension; and routing the telephone call based on a computing device location and the call routing preference, wherein routing the telephone call includes:

- routing the telephone call in an analog format to a telephone associated with the extension if the computing device associated with the user is in docking station, and
- routing the telephone call in a digital format to the computing device computing device is not in the docking station.

Thus, Applicants claim routing a telephone call to a telephone or to a computing device based on the location of the computing device. Further, the call is routed to the telephone

---

in an analog format and to the computing device in a digital format. Claims 11 and 21 similarly recite routing a telephone call to a telephone or to a computing device in analog or digital format based on the location of the computing device.

*Forte* discloses routing calls to a wireless device corresponding to a user. See paragraph 0007. Calls are not routed based on the location of a computing device. Further, calls are not routed to the computing device under certain conditions. Further, *Forte* does not disclose selecting between analog and digital formats in the manner recited in the claims. *Silver* is cited to teach routing a call based on a location of a user. However, *Silver* does not disclose the docking station as recited in the claims or selecting between analog and digital formats in the manner recited in the claims. Therefore, no combination of *Forte* and *Silver* can render obvious the invention as claimed in claims 1, 11 and 21.

Claims 2-10 depend from claim 1. Claims 12-20 depend from claim 11. Claims 22-30 depend from claim 21. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2-10, 12-20 and 22-30 are not rendered obvious by *Forte* and *Silver* for at least the reasons set forth above.

#### **CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims 1-30 are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

---

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number  
02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP**

Date: February 12, 2009

/Paul A. Mendonsa/

Paul A. Mendonsa  
Reg. No. 42,879

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 439-8778